

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 11-13, 19, 21, 22, 24-27 and 33-43 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13, and 27 being the independent claims. No amendments are sought in this Reply. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5, 13, 19, 27, and 33-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hasha et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,734,879), hereinafter Hasha, in view of Sharood et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0022991 A1), hereinafter Sharood, and further in view of Chailleux (U.S. Patent No. 7,360,159 B2), hereinafter Chailleux. Also, claims 1, 5, 11-13, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, and 33-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Dresti et al. (Pub. No. US 2003/0103088 A1), hereinafter Dresti, in view of Humpleman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,479 B1), herein after Humpleman, and further in view of Chailleux. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1, 13, and 27 recite features that distinguish over the applied references.

Claim 1 recites, for example:

a third set of control objects representing one or more affiliate system components, the one or more affiliate system components being *capable of providing an input to said selected system component* and *associated with performing the selected activity* and *capable of being controlled by proxy via a control object from said first set and/or said second set of control objects*, and *wherein the third set of control objects are configured to be pre-configured by a user to be hidden from display on the user interface*, while maintaining the user interface at a constant size regardless of whether the third set of control objects are displayed or hidden from display.

Claim 13 recites, for example:

hiding from display on the user interface one or more affiliate system components that are associated with performing the selected activity, but are pre-configured by a user not to be displayed, while maintaining the user interface at a constant size regardless of whether the one or more affiliate system components are displayed or hidden from display...

Claim 27 recites, for example:

eighth computer readable program code for *hiding from display on the user interface one or more affiliate system components that are associated with performing the selected activity, but are pre-configured by a user not to be displayed*, while maintaining the user interface at a constant size regardless of whether the one or more affiliate system components are displayed or hidden from display.

The Examiner states on pages 5-6 of the Office Action, regarding Hasha and Sharood, and similarly on page 12 of the Office Action, regarding Dresti and Humpleman, that none of these references teaches or suggests:

a third set of control objects representing one or more affiliate system components, the one or more affiliate system components being capable of providing an input to said selected system component and associated with performing the selected activity, and capable of being controlled by proxy via a control object from said first set and/or said second set of control objects, and wherein the third set of control objects are configured to be pre-configured by a user to be hidden from display on the user interface, while maintaining the user interface at a constant size regardless of whether the third set of control objects are displayed or hidden from display.

Rather, the Examiner relies on Chailleux to allegedly teach or suggest these features. Applicants disagree.

Chailleux is directed to a graphical user interface used to help sort or edit a slide presentation using a program called Leelou. *See*, Chailleux col. 5, lines 15-40. In one embodiment, Chailleux discusses that control icons can be “hidden” from view to allow for more of the graphical display to be occupied by the presentation slides. *See*, Chailleux col. 10, lines 8-15 and col. 11, lines 42-46. However, both in the portions of Chailleux relied upon by the Examiner, shown below, and throughout Chailleux, there is no teaching or suggestion of at least the claimed “a third set of control objects representing one or more affiliate system components...associated with performing the selected activity...wherein the third set of control objects are configured to be pre-configured by a user to be hidden from display on the user interface,” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited, using respective language shown above, in claims 13 and 27.

When determining whether a claim is obvious, an Examiner must make "a searching comparison of the claimed invention – **including all its limitations** – with the teaching of the prior art." *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Thus, "obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim." *CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l. Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)). This is lacking in the Office Action. For example, at page 6 of the Office Action the Examiner states Chailleux teaches (emphasis added):

Chailleux discloses an authoring software for creating presentations for playback [column 3, lines 55-61]. As shown in [figure 6], a button allows a list view to be made visible where operations on the slides may be performed [column 9, lines 34-54; figures 6-7]. **Additionally, a button shown in [figure 8] allows a control panel to be shown/hidden [column 10, lines 8-12].** The control panel allows the user to step through each slide [column 11, lines 42-58]. **Hiding the controls reduces the clutter on the interface when the controls are not needed.** Creating a slide presentation in which slides are viewed in a certain order is similar to creating a playlist of songs in the sense that similar controls are needed to define the order of items as well as to scroll through each item. Since Hasha and Sharood disclose creating a playlist [Hasha, figure 4] and providing controls related to the playlist, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include controls that are pre-configured by the user to be hidden, as taught by Chailleux, to perform a selected activity in the interface of Hasha and Sharood. This would reduce the clutter on the interface when the controls are not needed.

Thus, the Examiner first admits Hasha, Sharood, Dresti, and Humpleman lack at least above noted distinguishing features, and then relies on Chailleux to teach them. However, throughout the Office Action the Examiner's reliance on Chailleux is only to teach the claimed "are displayed or hidden from display." The Examiner does not rely on Chailleux to teach any of the other claim features the Examiner has admitted are missing from Hasha, Sharood, Dresti, and Humpleman, e.g., "a third set of control objects representing one or more affiliate system components...associated with performing the selected activity...wherein the third set of control objects are configured to be pre-configured by a user to be hidden from display on the user interface."

Thus, even conceding that the claimed “are displayed or hidden from display,” is taught in Chailleux, the Examiner provided no citation to any portion of Chailleux that teaches or suggests at least the claimed “a third set of control objects representing one or more affiliate system components, the one or more affiliate system components being capable of providing an input to said selected system component and associated with performing the selected activity, and capable of being controlled by proxy via a control object from said first set and/or said second set of control objects, and wherein the third set of control objects are configured to be pre-configured by a user to be hidden from display on the user interface,” is taught or suggested in any of the applied references.

Therefore, as the Examiner has not provided any teaching in Chailleux that cures ***all of*** the deficiencies of Hasha, Sharood, Dresti, and Humpleman regarding at least the above-noted distinguishing features, Chailleux cannot be used to cure the Examiner admitted deficiencies of Hasha, Sharood, Dresti, and Humpleman. Hence, the applied references cannot be used to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 1, 13, and 27.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 13 and 17, and pass these claims to allowance. Also, at least based on their respective dependencies to claims 1, 13, and 27, claims 5, 11-12, 19, 21, 22, 24-26 and 33-43 should also be found allowable over the applied references, as well as for the additional distinguishing features.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Reply to Office Action of January 3, 2011

KILLIAN *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/783,511

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Jason D. Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 4/4/11

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

1340063_1.DOCX